

REMARKS

Claims 50-69 remain in this application. Claims 1-49 have been cancelled, without prejudice to applicants subsequent pursuit of claims of equivalent or broader scope. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weinberg; Claims 24-25 and 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg; Claims 3-6, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, 26-29, 31, 33, 40-41, 43-44, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Astiz; and Claims 7-8, 17, 20-21, 30, 32, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Astiz and further in view of Sitka. All of these rejections are respectfully traversed. In light of the amendments as well as the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 50-69 are in condition for allowance.

As described in the Applicants' last response, an aspect of the present invention provides a more efficient way to assess the information accessible through a wide area network search on an Internet search engine or directory. In response to a query for information located on a computer network, map information is collected or served from memory to provide more detailed information regarding particular "hits" returned by a search engine. The map information may be used, for example, to generate graphical maps summarizing the information to which a Web page provides access. A list of items responsive to a particular query is compiled, with items in the list associated with map information. Graphical maps of a search result in the list may be quickly displayed, for example, in response to a "mouse-over" of a listed item. A person viewing search results can therefore more quickly determine whether a particular result is worthy of further inspection. Claims 50-69 are intended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim this aspect of the invention, which the prior art fails to disclose or to suggest.

In particular, Weinberg, Astiz, and Sitka, both individually, and in combination, fail

to disclose or to suggest:

- mapping a plurality of target pages, each of the target pages having a network address and comprising at least one hyperlink to a related page;

- identifying a set of linked related pages for each of the plurality of target pages;

- selecting objects from each set of linked related pages, comprising at least one hyperlink from a first page to a second page in the set of related pages, for each of the plurality of target pages;

- generating map information regarding each set of linked related pages, the mapping information comprising a descriptor of each of the objects selected from each set and a descriptor of selected pages from each set, for each of the plurality of target pages; and

- compiling a list in response to a query for information, the list comprising identifiers for the plurality of target pages having a set of linked related pages comprising information responsive to the query, wherein each identifier in the list is associated with at least a portion of the map information generated for each respective set of linked related pages,

as defined by Claims 50 and 60. Instead, Weinberg discloses a diagnostic tool to be used by a Webmaster in evaluating the performance and effectiveness of Web sites. Astiz discloses generating and storing a navigational map for a web page, but fails to disclose or to suggest compiling a list of mapped pages in response to a general information query. For its part, Sitka merely discloses deleting information from a database after a period of time has elapsed, and does not concern the supply of mapped information in response to a general database query. Claims 50 and 60 are therefore allowable, and the remaining claims are also allowable, at least as depending from allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 50-69 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Serial No. 09/549,505
August 2, 2004
Page 8

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a one-month extension of time, extending to August 2, 2004 (the first business day following August 1, 2004), the period for response to the Office Action dated April 1, 2004. In addition, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and accompanying fee are enclosed. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Berliner', written over a horizontal line.

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

Date: August 2, 2004

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000